

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, FEBRUARY 20, 1990
UU 220, 3:00 - 5:00 pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:12 pm.

I. Minutes: The minutes from the January 30, 1990 Academic Senate meeting were approved without change.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Attention was directed to the Academic Senate Reading List. In particular "The 1989 California State University Growth Plan for 1990-2005 (CSU)" prepared by the Chancellor's Office.

The Chair informed the Academic Senate that since there are no Business Items on the Executive Committee agenda, the meeting scheduled for February 27, 1990 will be cancelled.

III. Reports:

A. President's Office

B. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
P Bailey stated that faculty nominations for the Multi-criteria Admissions Committee and Academic Planning Committee had been received.

C. Statewide Senators
The Chair took the opportunity to inform the Academic Senate that the proposed Doctorate of Education to be awarded by the CSU campuses is being discussed. The issue is sensitive and centers on the lack of adequate resources for implementation.

D. ASI Representatives
No report.

E. George Stanton, Test Officer for Counseling and Testing, summarized the Report on the Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS). The survey is conducted every four to five years. The test covers four areas: personal data, education priorities, level of satisfaction, and obstacles or problems. The results were compiled from 918 Cal Poly student responses taken at random. Highlights were presented on pages four and five of the Academic Senate Agenda. No significant changes in the data were observed.

F. Arthur Gloster, Vice President for Information Systems, discussed computing resources at Cal Poly, the electronic campus-today, networking concerns, the optical fiber proposal, the electronic campus-tomorrow, and goals for the 1990's. Presentation materials are available in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H). J Weatherby noted that the identified "goals for the 1990's" required policy decisions that should be addressed by both the faculty and administration. The Long-Range Planning Committee should be involved in the discussion. Gloster concurred with the statement and added that it is necessary to move slowly in the process to "cover all bases."

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):

A. Resolution on International Baccalaureate Program (second reading): M/S/P (Smith/Weber) as modified. R Terry stated the resolution as presented reflected the

comments made by the Academic Senate during the first reading. Helen Linstrum, Interim Admissions Officer, worked with the Instruction Committee in developing the resolution. T Bailey questioned the intent of items 2 and 3 in the Resolved clause (page 7). R Terry stated that item 2 deals with university credit, while item 3 involves university elected credit. J Ahern asked if foreign graduate students applying to graduate school would receive GE&B credit. H Linstrum stated that elective credit or specific GE&B credit would be given as recommended by the faculty. H Wight proposed that Resolved clause #4 (page 7) be modified to include laboratory work, since laboratory work is important to Cal Poly. It was accepted as a friendly amendment by the Chair of the Instruction Committee to change the wording:

4. Course-specific credit may be granted with the concurrence of the Department upon determining that the IBP course corresponds, including laboratory content, to a specific course in the Cal Poly catalog.
-
- B. Resolution on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Unit Employees (first reading). Moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. P Murphy stated that the resolution uses contract language. The purpose of the resolution is to include Periodic Evaluations of Faculty Unit Employees in CAM since this evaluation is mandated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU/contract). Items A 4 and 5 (Page 12) will be revised to reflect that the evaluation will be conducted by "the appropriate administrator." L Dalton expressed a concern that evaluations in small departments place a heavy burden on faculty. As procedures expand the burden will increase. H Mallareddy was concerned that CAM 345.3 A.1. (Page 11) did not include faculty. The "department head/chair and the dean" evaluate tenured faculty for Merit Salary Adjustment. Any dispute would follow the normal appeal/grievance process. N Havandjian questioned whether the Merit Salary Adjustment was automatic at the highest step. The Chair stated that the adjustments are not automatic.
 - C. Resolution on Departmental Support for International Education at Cal Poly. Moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. J Weatherby stated that campus catalogs provide a description for international programs. This resolution is designed to inform the student by identifying curriculum in the Catalog that can support international programs. The Chair stated that the wording of this resolution was modified by the Executive Committee. N Havandjian questioned how the issue of student resources entered into utilization of the program.
 - D. IT 132X "The Automobile" (first reading): M/S/P (Mori/McGary) without dissent to send this item back to committee. The Chair informed the Academic Senate that this item appears on the agenda without Executive Committee review because it did not arrive prior to the last Executive Committee meeting and there are currently time constraints for submitting 1990-1992 curriculum courses (February 16, 1990 Memorandum to Executive Committee, M Snow). D Hafemeister, Chair of the GE&B Committee, passed out the criteria used in assessing courses for area F.2. He stated that IT 132X does not meet the criteria and is therefore not an appropriate course for inclusion. T Bailey added that this course was submitted to the Curriculum Committee, has not been reviewed, and may not be appropriate for consideration at this time. J Murphy allowed S Lutrin, Vice President, to Chair the Senate as he spoke in favor of the course and gave a brief history of its development. L Mosher stated that the course was originally a two-unit course and developed into a three-unit course to meet area F.2 criteria. L Burgunder did not see the course meeting the established criteria. R Zeuschner saw two areas of concern: one dealt with course content and the other procedures. Both need to be addressed. C Pokorny stated that the course description is not consistent with the expanded course outline.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.